DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 206 729 TM 810 645

AUTHOR Farrar, Carroll D.
TITLE Developing and Utilizing Undergraduate Program Objectives for Developing Evaluative Instruments.
PUB DATE Nov 80
NOTE 14p.: Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, November, 1980).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Educational Objectives; *Education Majors; *Graduate Surveys; *Program Evaluation; Questionnaires; *Teacher Education Programs; *Test Construction
IDENTIFIERS *Program Objectives; *University of New Orleans LA

ABSTRACT

A follow-up study of recent graduates of the College of Education at the University of New Orleans was developed to continue the organized assessment program of the College. Information gathered by the investigation is intended to provide the basis for revision of the undergraduate teacher education program and the development of effective in-service programs for teachers. An instrument was designed to assess the importance of each objective in the work of the teacher and to determine how well the college program prepared the graduate to function in that area. Each graduate evaluated each item on two scales, adding comments about the program at the end of the instrument. The instructions and instrument are included, as are the ten program objectives which are the source of the thirty items of the follow-up instrument. (Author/GK)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED2067729

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

DEVELOPING AND UTILIZING UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAM OBJECTIVES FOR DEVELOPING EVALUATIVE INSTRUMENTS

Carroll D. Farrar

University of New Orleans

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
C. D. Farrar
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

TM 810 645

Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association
New Orleans, November 1980

DEVELOPMENT OF AN INSTRUMENT FOR EVALUATION BASED ON PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

The teacher education program at the University of New Orleans, like most others in the country, was originally planned by an eclectic approach with suggestions from professors, administrators, state department personnel, legislators and others. Until recently, courses have been revised, added to the program and removed from it using the same basic approach. During the last few years there has been a growing awareness that the evaluation of program outcomes has been inadequate. Stiles and Parker (1969) have developed this position very well.

In the College of Education at the University of New Orleans, several measures of progress are now made by appropriate personnel at various points in the students' movement through the program. Using program objectives as a control, the curriculum is carefully planned by a university committee. Students evaluate activities within courses to assure that these courses are implemented as planned and that specific procedures are being utilized. Teacher-made tests are used to determine the extent of student mastery of previously specified cognitive objectives. College supervisors monitor student application of appropriate concepts and techniques in classroom situations. Prior to this study, no follow-up investigation based on program objectives had been conducted.

This follow-up study of recent graduates of the College of Education at the University of New Orleans was designed to continue the organized assessment program of the College. Information gathered by the investigation is intended to provide the basis for revision of the undergraduate teacher

education program and the development of effective in-service programs for teachers.

To develop an instrument from the general objectives of the undergraduate program, it was necessary to generate a pool of more specific objectives for each general objective and select appropriate items from each. There are ten general objectives stated for the undergraduate program. These are stated in general terms which permit the generation of more specific objectives for purposes of the instrument being developed. The researchers developed a pool of specific objectives for each general objective. In the generation of these specific objectives, the Graduate Follow-up and Evaluation developed by Dr. R. Mikell O'Donnel (1978) was very helpful. From the pool of specific objectives developed for each general objective, colleagues were asked to assist with the selection of the most important and representative for inclusion in an instrument of manageable length. This process resulted in thirty (30) items for the evaluation of graduates of the program.

The instrument was designed to assess the importance of each objective in the work of the teacher and to determine how well the college program prepared the graduate to function in that area. To accomplish this, each graduate was asked to evaluate each item on two scales. At the end of the instrument the graduate was asked to add comments concerning the program. The three areas of strengths, weaknesses and recommended changes were suggested. The instructions and the instrument for the graduates appear below. The ten program objectives have been added to show the reader the source of each of the thirty items of the follow-up instrument.

DIRECTIONS: On the left-hand side, please evaluate each item as to its importance to teaching by circling the numeral. (1) undesirable, (2) desirable, (3) important, (4) very important (5) essential. On the right, circle the numeral that best describes the preparation you received in your program. (1) poor, (2) below average, (3) average, (4) above average, (5) excellent.

1. Develop a background of knowledge in general education.

1 2 3 4 5	A. I have a broad cultural background in science, art, literature, history, etc. to enrich my teaching.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	B. My command of the language is adequate.	1 2 3 4 5

2. Develop a background of knowledge in one or more subject matter concentration(s) or specialization(s).

1 2 3 4 5	C. I am competent in my area of subject matter concentration(s) or specialization(s).	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	D. I provide clear illustrations and applications in my subject matter area of concentration(s).	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	E. I teach skills appropriate to areas of learning.	1 2 3 4 5

3. Develop an awareness of the relation between socio-cultural factors and the educative process.

1 2 3 4 5	F. I am skillful and comfortable working with students from a variety of racial, ethnic, and socio-economic backgrounds.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	G. I anticipate and prepare strategies and materials to meet pupils needs and overcome difficulties.	1 2 3 4 5

4. Develop an awareness of teaching as a profession.

1 2 3 4 5	H. My practices conform to ethical standards established for the teaching profession.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	I. I maintain productive relationships with the administration and staff of the school.	1 2 3 4 5

5. Understand and identify the learner's emotional, social, physical and intellectual needs.

1	2	3	4	5	J.	I assess pupil knowledge, skills, and interests prior to instruction.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	K.	I involve pupils in planning.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	L.	I am able to teach subject matter and provide for the needs and interests of pupils.	1	2	3	4	5

6. Identify and specify instructional goals and objectives.

1	2	3	4	5	M.	I identify and specify appropriate instructional goals and objectives.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	N.	The objectives of my class periods are understood by pupils.	1	2	3	4	5

7. Be knowledgeable about and impliment a variety of teaching strategies which are appropriate to specified instructional objectives and to learner needs.

1	2	3	4	5	O.	I provide instructional opportunities that allow for varying styles of learning and levels of development.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	P.	My learning activities are designed to accomplish specified instructional objectives.	1	2	3	4	5

8. Identify and utilize a variety of appropriate instructional materials.

1	2	3	4	5	Q.	I provide a variety of instructional materials to impliment the instructional program.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	R.	I use community resources for the educational benefit of pupils.	1	2	3	4	5

9. Recognize and develop evaluation procedures which focus on learner achievement, specified objectives, and instructional effectiveness.

1	2	3	4	5	S.	I provide various evaluation techniques designed to assess skills and weaknesses of pupils.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	T.	I gain insight into the personal needs of pupils through conferences and observations.	1	2	3	4	5

1	2	3	4	5	U.	I devise evaluation procedures from instructional objectives.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	V.	I utilize evaluation guidelines of the school and school system.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	W.	I hold informal discussions with pupils to inform them of their progress.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	X.	I interpret pupil evaluation data for reteaching or enrichment.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	Y.	I analyze and evaluate the teaching process in my classroom.	1	2	3	4	5

10. Acquire and apply skills of classroom management and interpersonal relationships which enhance the educational environment and promote student learning.

1	2	3	4	5	Z.	My pupils work productively in small groups.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	AA.	I recognize and encourage pupil leadership qualities.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	BB.	I provide an atmosphere that encourages pupils to work effectively and to use good work habits.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	CC.	I establish and maintain a classroom that promotes pupil participation and constructive activites.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	DD.	I maintain good discipline and effective direction of my classes.	1	2	3	4	5

Use the space provided below for comments concerning the program.

1. Strengths

2. Weaknesses

3. Recommended changes

The principal of each graduate was asked to evaluate the same items that were evaluated by the graduates in much the same way. In the case of the principal, the evaluation was in terms of the importance of the item in the school and how well the graduate functions in that area. The essential change in the items was that the personal pronouns were dropped. The directions for the principals' form of the instrument and five of the items are given below.

DIRECTIONS: On the left-hand side please evaluate each item as to its importance in your school. (1) undesirable, (2) desirable, (3) important, (4) very important, (5) essential. On the right please evaluate the teacher on each of these items (1) poor, (2) below average, (3) average, (4) above average, (5) excellent.

1. Develop a background of knowledge in general education.

1	2	3	4	5	A. Has a broad cultural background in science, art, literature, history, etc. to enrich teaching.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	B. Has adequate command of the language.	1	2	3	4	5

2. Develop a background of knowledge in one or more subject matter concentration(s) or specialization(s).

1	2	3	4	5	C. Is competent in area of subject matter concentration(s) or specialization(s).	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	D. Provides clear illustrations and applications in subject matter areas of concentration(s) or specialization(s) and relevant related areas.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	E. Teaches skills appropriate to areas of learning.	1	2	3	4	5

General Information and Status in Teaching

On the first page of the follow-up study, some of the usual information appears that would hopefully be of value in encouraging graduates to complete and return the instrument. The usual data was collected that would be useful in the classification and analysis of the information. In addition, some information was collected that is of current concern in the field of education.

The over-supply of teachers is well known and thoroughly examined by many authorities including Ornstein (1979). As a result of this and other factors enrollment in undergraduate teacher education programs has decreased drastically in recent years. In fact, there is reason to believe that there may develop a teacher shortage in a very short time. Because of uncertainty in this area and because this type of evaluation will be repeated frequently, the decision was made to collect information concerning the primary reason for graduates in education not entering the teaching field.

It was important to get the name of the school in which each teacher who responded to this instrument was employed. The evaluation plan was for the principal of each graduate to evaluate the new teacher on the same instrument. For this study, the system worked very well. When the study is repeated, it might be wise to ask for the name of the school on the principals' form of the instrument.

Questions were asked concerning key persons who provided support and assistance during the first teaching of the graduate and the amount of help that was needed. These questions were designed to determine the effectiveness of the induction and in-service programs of the schools and

school systems. Answers to these questions might also indicate the degree of need for college programs for the beginning teacher.

Discipline is another problem area that has been identified in national surveys like the Gallup Poll (1979). To determine the extent to which this problem is a concern of the recent graduate of the College of Education at the University of New Orleans, the question was asked about the percentage of time spent attending to discipline problems. Answers to this question could indicate that the undergraduate program is adequate in this area or signal a need for additions to the preparation presently provided. Of course, these answers could also be important to those school officials involved with in-service programs for teachers.

The lost investment when young teachers leave teaching voluntarily which is explained by Castetter (1976) has been a problem. Therefore, a question was designed to determine the extent of satisfaction or dissatisfaction with teaching. It was felt that the answers to this question might be supportive of present preservice and in-service programs and/or be indicative of the need for greater efforts. The first page of the follow-up instrument is shown below.

UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAM EVALUATION

UNIVERSITY OF NEW ORLEANS

As a part of an effort to appraise the effectiveness of our teacher education programs we are soliciting reactions from our graduates related to aspects of these programs. You have been selected as a representative of your graduating class for this survey. Your name is not requested so that all information will be completely confidential. Your openness and accuracy in completing this survey is greatly desired.

The faculty of the College of Education wish to thank you for your cooperation.

DIRECTIONS: If you are teaching or have taught please complete the entire form. If you have not taught, complete only Part I.

PART I. GENERAL INFORMATION

A. Undergraduate major

Elementary _____ Area of Concentration _____

Secondary _____ Major _____ Minor _____

B. Sex and age

Male _____ Female _____ Age _____

C. If not currently teaching or have not taught, check primary reason

_____1. Unable to find teaching position
_____2. Another career
_____3. Further education
_____4. Dissatisfied with teaching
_____5. Other (specify) _____

D. Do you plan to teach in the future? Yes _____ No _____

PART II STATUS IN TEACHING

A. Name of school were employed _____

B. During your first teaching, did a key person provide you with support and assistance? Yes _____ No _____ Specify _____

C. Was extensive help needed? Yes _____ No _____

D. What percentage of your time do you spend attending to discipline problems? _____ %

E. Check the most appropriate description of your present attitude

1. Very satisfied _____ 2. Somewhat satisfied _____
3. Neutral _____ 4. Somewhat dissatisfied _____
5. Very dissatisfied _____

Plans For Other Follow-Up Studies
Some Lessons Learned

This study was the beginning of a continuous evaluation of graduates of the College of Education at the University of New Orleans. Graduates from the Fall 1977, Spring 1978 and Summer 1978 participated in this study. The evaluation instrument was mailed to 240 graduates. The plan is to use the same instrument with a different group of students that have been out of school the same length of time. In addition, the 1977-1978 graduates will be requested to evaluate the program again to provide a later view of the importance of each item to teaching and how well the program prepared them to function in that area.

Some lessons were learned in this first study and some additional insight gained that will be useful. One lesson was that the reproduction of questionnaires for each major group (graduates and principals) on different colored paper eliminated confusion in the handling and classification of returns. In the next study we will use some colors for the recent graduates and the experienced graduates and different colors for the principals of the two groups.

Of the 240 graduates who were mailed evaluation instruments in this study, only 79 or 32% responded. No follow-up attempts were made to encourage more participation. Plans for the next study should include the use of a follow-up card, mailed at the appropriate time, thanking those who have already returned the instrument for doing so and encouraging those who have not to participate.

Instruments have not been developed to evaluate the subject matter areas of concentration and specializations based on objectives that have been stated for those areas. In this follow-up study some items were included which apply to areas of concentration and specialization but items were not developed to evaluate the objectives developed by the faculty especially for each area. Future studies should evaluate the importance of these areas to teaching and the schools and the extent to which these objectives are being accomplished.

An instrument can be developed for use by the students in classes which the graduates teach. This instrument could evaluate the importance of program objectives to student learning and the degree to which the graduate achieves the objectives. In some future evaluation, such an instrument should be developed and used in the classes of a sample of the graduates. This kind of evaluation would be time consuming and require considerable public relations work but it would add an important dimension to the program evaluation.

REFERENCES

Castetter, W. B. The Personnel Function in Educational Administration 2nd Edition. New York: Macmillan, 1976, pp. 205-227.

Gallup, G. H. "The Eleventh Annual Gallup Poll of the Public's Attitudes Toward The Public Schools," Phi Delta Kappan, September, 1979, pp. 33-45.

O'Donnell, R. M. "Graduate Follow-Up and Education," paper, March 8, 1978 (mimeographed)

Ornstein, A. C. "Teacher Surplus? Trends in Education's Supply and Demand," Educational Horizons, Spring, (1979) pp. 112-118.

Stiles, L. J. and Parker, R. P. "Teacher Education Programs," Encyclopedia of Educational Research, 1969, pp. 1, 414 - 1, 423.